REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were pending in the application. Claims 9-11, 14 and 15 were deemed allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claims 1-8, 12, 13 and 16-30 were rejected. Claims 1, 7-11, 13-16 and 30 are being amended. Claims 1-30 are currently pending. No new matter is being added.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the opportunity on June 21, 2004 to discuss the *Granovsky* reference, the embodiments described in the disclosure, and generally the claims and claim amendments requested herein.

In section 1, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 12, 13 and 16-30 under 35 USC § 102 as unpatentable over *Granovsky*. The Examiner specifically asserted that Fig. 1 showed a logical OR operation and that Fig. 18 showed a logical AND operation.

Granovsky FIG.1 shows two surveillance zones (1, 2) each surrounded by a gate comprising two panels. Antennas 3 and 6 form a first panel; antennas 4 and 7 form a second panel; and antennas 5 and 8 form a third panel. The first and second panels form a gate that surrounds zone 1; the second and third panels form a gate that surrounds zone 2. Each gate compares signals (possibly caused by a magnetic device) in its corresponding zone with ambient noise to determine if a change condition has occurred. The Granovsky system performs the identical test several times in a row to reduce the risk that some temporary event falsely registered a change condition. If each of the multiple identical tests indicates a change condition, the Granovsky system sounds the alarm. As discussed during the interview, *Granovsky* always applies the same test (*see* col. 22 line 13 through col. 25 line 62) on the same variables to determine whether to sound the alarm. A not-so-temporary event that affects the test would cause a false alarm.

Granovsky does not describe "selecting a plurality of different antenna patterns, each antenna pattern configured to receive a signal corresponding to an independent variable" as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 13. Since Granovsky teaches conducting multiple identical tests, it does not teach antenna patterns wherein each antenna pattern is configured to receive "a signal corresponding to an independent variable." Similarly, *Granovsky* does not teach "a plurality of independent variables according to ... diversity," as recited in independent

claims 16 and 30. Accordingly, Application respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, 16 and 30 and claims 2-8, 12 and 17-29 dependent therefrom are patentable over Granovsky.

Also, Granovsky does not teach "selecting, from a plurality of predetermined logical combinations, a logical combination" as recited in claims 1, 13, 16 and 30. Granovsky only includes a single logical combination, namely, to OR the gates and to AND the consecutive identical tests. Only if all consecutive tests prove positive at either one of the gates will Granovsky sound the alarm. Accordingly, Granovsky does not teach selecting a logical combination from a plurality of logical combinations. Because of this feature, in certain embodiment of the present invention, users can select a logical combination to improve such problems as false positives and/or false negatives. The Granovsky system does not enable a user to select different logical combinations.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if it would in any way advance prosecution of this case.

Date: <u>June 23, 2004</u>

Respectfully submitted,

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey LLP
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Tel: (650) 856-6500
Fax: (650) 843-8777

By
    Marc A. Sockol
    Attorney for Applicants
    Registration No.: 40,823